



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,778	04/19/2005	Sean Adkins	10002/315087	6051

23370 7590 08/11/2009

JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ  
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP  
1100 PEACHTREE STREET  
SUITE 2800  
ATLANTA, GA 30309

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2009

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10531778	4/19/2005	ADKINS ET AL.	10002/315087

JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ  
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP  
1100 PEACHTREE STREET  
SUITE 2800  
ATLANTA, GA 30309

**EXAMINER**

DENNIS P. JOSEPH

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2629	20090801
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

This communication is in response to the new claim amendments filed on July 23, 2009 as those amendments are non-responsive. Applicant is also asked to clarify a couple of issues as well, thank you.

The new claim amendments are directed to a first and second projection system, each system having a plurality of SLM devices. However, this is a different embodiment than from what was originally claimed before those claims were cancelled. As a result, since all of the claims are directed to this new presentation, there are no claims to examine, so that is why this communication is being sent. Applicant is kindly requested to amend the claim language to adhere to the original presentation or argue that there is no patentable difference between one or multiple projector systems.

Furthermore, examiner is also wondering where the support for these amendments are, specifically being ablet to use a two projector system. The only figure that shows a two projector system is the prior art figure of Claim 1. While the specification says the invention could be applied to multiple projectors, there isn't any detail on how that could be accomplished. Is it intended to just duplicate the effects of one projector and apply it as a second projector?

Applicant is kindly asked to respond to these issues, thank you.

/Amr Awad/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629